1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7 8 9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA	
10	SHAWN FRANCIS,	
11	Plaintiff,	CASE NO. C12-6023 RBL-JRC
12	v.	ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO FILE AN AMENDED
13	STEVEN HAMMOND et al,.	COMPLAINT WITHOUT PREJUDICE
14	Defendants.	
15	The District Court has referred this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 civil rights action to United States	
1617	Magistrate Judge J. Richard Creatura. The Court's authority for the referral is 28 U.S.C. §	
18	636(b)(1)(A) and (B), and local Magistrate Judge Rules MJR3 and MJR4.	
19	Plaintiff asks the Court for leave to file an amended complaint that adds an additional	
20	plaintiff and also adds negligence claims (ECF No. 37). Defendants do not oppose the addition	
21	of plaintiff's negligence claims, however, defendants do oppose addition of a new plaintiff with	
22	different medical issues and claims (ECF No. 40).	
23	While Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a)(2) states that leave to amend should be freely given, the court	
24	must consider prejudice to the opposing party. DC	CD Programs, Ltd. v.Leighton, 833 F.2d 183,

186 (9th Cir. 1987). Addition of a new plaintiff with different medical claims would mean discovery would start over. Defendants would be required to begin discovery anew to address the claims of this additional plaintiff. The Court denies plaintiff's motion. Defendants have stated that they do not oppose plaintiff's addition of negligence claims (ECF No. 40). Local Rule 15 requires a party seeking to amend the complaint to provide a copy of the proposed amended complaint. The Court does not have a proposed amended complaint before it that only adds negligence claims to plaintiff's case. The Court denies plaintiff's current motion to add additional claims without prejudice so that plaintiff can submit a new motion and proposed amended complaint that is consistent with this order. Dated this 8th day of January, 2014. J. Richard Creatura United States Magistrate Judge